

REMARKS

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Office Action dated February 11, 2008, has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

Claims 1-22 and 25-28 have been amended. No claims have been canceled. No claims have been added. Accordingly, claims 1-28 remain pending in this application. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims is respectfully requested.

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. *Office Action* at p. 2, ¶ 1. Applicants have amended claim 3, and request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection.

The Office objected to claim 5 for informalities noted therein. *Office Action* at p. 2, ¶ 2. Applicants have corrected claim 5 accordingly, and ask the Examiner to withdraw the objection.

The Office objected to claim 25 for informalities noted therein. *Office Action* at p. 2, ¶ 3. Applicants have corrected claim 25 accordingly, and ask the Examiner to withdraw the objection.

Claims 1 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,062,049 to Martinsson (hereinafter “Martinsson”). *Office Action* at p. 2, ¶ 2. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and request reconsideration.

Independent claim 1 is allowable over the cited references in that claim 1 recites a combination of elements including, for example, “folds having a folded edge at the end portions.” *Martinsson* does not teach or suggest at least this feature of the claimed invention.

The Office broadly asserts that *Martinsson* depicts “a folded edge, or bent part, exists on the reduced part” *Office Action* at pp. 2-3, ¶ 2. The Office, however, provides no designation of the particular part of *Martinsson* that is considered to anticipate the folded edge. *Martinsson* teaches a drum comprising a cylindrical envelope, one end of which is closed by a gable. See *Martinsson* at col. 2, lines 30-33, and FIG. 1. As shown, the end portion at the laundry receiving end is bent, not folded, inward towards the opening and the gable is inserted in the other end

portion. Nowhere does *Martinsson* teach folding the end portions. Thus, *Martinsson* does not teach or suggest “folds having a folded edge at the end portions,” as recited in independent claim 1. For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully request that the Office withdraw the 35 U.S.C. §102(b) rejection of independent claim 1. Claim 3 depends from independent claim 1. It stands to reason that the 35 U.S.C. §102(b) rejection of this dependent claim should be withdrawn as well.

Claims 2, 4, 5 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Martinsson* in view of U.S. Patent No. 1,645,971 to Riegel (hereinafter “*Riegel*”). *Office Action* at p. 3, ¶ 4. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and request reconsideration.

Riegel fails to cure the deficiencies of *Martinsson*. *Riegel* teaches a cylinder that tapers to a narrow straight band portion 11 at the ends. *See Riegel* at p. 2, col. 1, lines 53-56. There is absolutely no teaching or suggestion in *Riegel* of “folds having a folded edge at the end portions,” as recited in independent claim 1. Thus, *Riegel* does not teach or suggest the features of claims 2, 4, 5 and 25, which depend from claim 1.

Indeed, the Office only relied on *Riegel* to disclose a drum with a butt welded seam and bead portions formed in the body portion. *See Office Action* at p. 3, ¶ 4. Because none of the cited references, either individually or in combination, teaches or suggests each and every element of independent claim 1, they also fail to teach or suggest each and every element of claims 2, 4, 5 and 25, which depend from claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Office to withdraw the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claims 2, 4, 5 and 25.

Claims 6-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Martinsson*. *Office Action* at p. 3, ¶ 5. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and request reconsideration.

Applicants submit that *Martinsson* does not teach or suggest each and every element recited in claims 6-20. As previously discussed, *Martinsson* does not teach or suggest “folds having a folded edge at the end portions,” as recited in independent claim 1, the base claim from which claims 6-20 depends. Thus, claims 6-20 are patentably distinguishable over *Martinsson*. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Office withdraw the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claims 6-20.

Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Martinsson* in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,446,035 to Barrat et al. (hereinafter "*Barrat*"). *Office Action* at p. 4, ¶ 7. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and request reconsideration.

Barrat fails to cure the deficiencies of *Martinsson*. *Barrat* teaches compositions of matter useful in the manufacture of cleaning and fabric treating compositions. *See Barrat* at Abstract. There is absolutely no teaching or suggestion in *Barrat* of "folds having a folded edge at the end portions," as recited in independent claim 1. Thus, *Barrat* does not teach or suggest the features of claim 21, which depends from claim 1.

Indeed, the Office only relied on *Barrat* to disclose using an enamel to coat a drum to prevent erosion due to detergent. *See Office Action* at page 4, ¶ 7. Because none of the cited references, either individually or in combination, teaches or suggests each and every element of independent claim 1, they also fail to teach or suggest each and every element of claim 21, which depends from claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Office withdraw the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claim 21.

Claims 22 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Martinsson* in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,901,465 to Boussetta et al. (hereinafter "*Boussetta*"). *Office Action* at p. 4, ¶ 8. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and request reconsideration.

Boussetta fails to cure the deficiencies of *Martinsson*. *Boussetta* teaches a clothes dryer including a drum with struts formed on the outside that define a belt receiving groove. *See Martinsson* at col. 3, lines 18-23 and FIG. 1. There is absolutely no teaching or suggestion in *Boussetta* of "folds having a folded edge at the end portions," as recited in independent claim 1. Thus, *Boussetta* does not teach or suggest the features of claims 22 and 24, which depend from claim 1.

Indeed, the Office only relied on *Boussetta* to disclose using metal bands on a drum to reduce vibrations. *See Office Action* at page 4, ¶ 8. Because none of the cited references, either individually or in combination, teaches or suggests each and every element of independent claim 1, they also fail to teach or suggest each and every element of claims 22 and 24, which depend from claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Office withdraw the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claims 22 and 24.

Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Martinsson in view of Boussetta and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,063,098 to Niwa et al. (hereinafter “Niwa”). *Office Action* at p. 4, ¶ 9. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and request reconsideration.

Niwa fails to cure the deficiencies of *Martinsson* in view of *Boussetta*. *Niwa* teaches a composite type of vibration damping material. *See Niwa* at col. 1, lines 9-11. There is absolutely no teaching or suggestion in *Niwa* of “folds having a folded edge at the end portions,” as recited in independent claim 1. Thus, *Niwa* does not teach or suggest the features of claim 23, which depend from claim 1.

Indeed, the Office only relied on *Niwa* to disclose a vibration dampening element comprising rubber. *See Office Action* at page 4, ¶ 9. Because none of the cited references, either individually or in combination, teaches or suggests each and every element of independent claim 1, they also fail to teach or suggest each and every element of claim 23, which depend from claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Office withdraw the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claim 23.

Claims 26-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Martinsson in view of Boussetta and alternatively in view of Riegel. *Office Action* at p. 4, ¶ 10. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and request reconsideration.

Independent claims 26, 27 and 28 are allowable over *Martinsson* in view of *Boussetta* and alternatively in view of *Riegel* in that claims 26, 27 and 28 similarly recite a combination of elements including, for example, “folds having a folded edge at the end portions.” As discussed above regarding independent claim 1, *Martinsson* does not teach or suggest “folds having a folded edge at the end portions.”

Boussetta fails to cure the deficiencies of *Martinsson*. *Boussetta* teaches a clothes dryer including a drum with struts formed on the outside that define a belt receiving groove. *See Martinsson* at col. 3, lines 18-23 and FIG. 1. There is absolutely no teaching or suggestion in *Boussetta* of “folds having a folded edge at the end portions.” Thus, *Boussetta* does not teach or suggest the features of independent claims 26, 27 and 28.

Riegel also fails to cure the deficiencies of *Martinsson*. *Riegel* teaches a cylinder that tapers to a narrow straight band portion 11 at the ends. See *Riegel* at p. 2, col. 1, lines 53-56. There is absolutely no teaching or suggestion in *Riegel* of “folds having a folded edge at the end portions,” as recited in independent claims 26, 27 and 28.

Accordingly, for the above stated reasons, Applicants respectfully request that the Office withdraw the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection of independent claims 26, 27 and 28.

Claims 1, 3 and 22-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over PCT Publication No. WO 03/008696 to Yoon (hereinafter “Yoon”) in view of *Martinsson* and further in view of *Riegel*. Office Action at p. 5, ¶ 12. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and request reconsideration.

Independent claim 1 is allowable over *Yoon* in view of *Martinsson* in that claim 1 recites a combination of elements including, for example, “folds having a folded edge at the end portions.” *Yoon* teaches a cylindrical drum with grooves along an outside surface of the drum and a drum belt wound at one side of the groove for driving the drum. See *Yoon* at page 6, lines 10-15 and FIG. 2. As pointed out by the Office, *Yoon* does not disclose bent parts. See *Office Action* at p. 5, ¶ 12. Thus, *Yoon* does not teach the features of claim 1.

Applicant respectfully asserts that *Martinsson* does not cure the deficiencies of *Yoon*. The Office broadly asserts that *Martinsson* depicts “a folded edge, or bent part, existing on the reduced part” *Office Action* at p. 5, ¶ 12. The Office, however, provides no designation of the particular part of *Martinsson* that is considered to anticipate the folded edge. *Martinsson* teaches a drum comprising a cylindrical envelope, one end of which is closed by a gable. See *Martinsson* at col. 2, lines 30-33, and FIG. 1. As shown, the end portion at the laundry receiving end is bent, not folded, inward towards the opening and the gable is inserted in the other end portion. Nowhere does *Martinsson* teach folding the end portions. Thus, *Martinsson* does not teach or suggest “folds having a folded edge at the end portions,” as recited in independent claim 1. Accordingly, none of the cited references, singly or in combination, teaches or suggests “folds having a folded edge at the end portions,” as recited in independent claim 1. For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully request that the Office withdraw the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of independent claim 1. Claims 3 and 22-24 depend from independent claim 1. It stands to

reason that the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of those dependent claims should be withdrawn as well.

Claims 2, 4-5 and 25-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Yoon* in view of *Martinsson* and further in view of *Riegel*. Office Action at p. 5, ¶ 13. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and request reconsideration.

Independent claim 1 is allowable over *Yoon* in view of *Martinsson* in that claim 1 recites a combination of elements including, for example, “folds having a folded edge at the end portions.” As discussed above regarding independent claim 1, *Yoon* in view of *Martinsson* does not teach or suggest “folds having a folded edge at the end portions.”

Riegel fails to cure the deficiencies of *Yoon* in view of *Martinsson*. *Riegel* teaches a cylinder that tapers to a narrow straight band portion 11 at the ends. See *Riegel* at p. 2, col. 1, lines 53-56. There is absolutely no teaching or suggestion in *Riegel* of “folds having a folded edge at the end portions,” as recited in independent claims 26, 27 and 28.

Indeed, the Office only relied on *Riegel* to disclose a drum with a butt welded seam and bead portions formed in the body portion. See *Office Action* at page 6, ¶ 13 : Because none of the cited references, either individually or in combination, teaches or suggests each and every element of independent claim 1, they also fail to teach or suggest each and every element of claims 2, 4-5 and 25-28, which depend from claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Office withdraw the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claims 2, 4-5 and 25-28.

Conclusion

The application is in condition for allowance. Early and favorable action is respectfully solicited.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.


If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the

filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. *A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.*

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: May 9, 2008

By


Mark R. Kresloff
Registration No. 42,766
McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 496-7500
Attorneys for Applicants